

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF ABADY WARD & MAAZEL LLP

JONATHAN S. ABADY  
MATTHEW D. BRINCKERHOFF  
ANDREW G. CELLI, JR.  
RICHARD D. EMERY  
DEBRA L. GREENBERGER  
DIANE L. HOUK  
DANIEL J. KORNSTEIN  
JULIA P. KUAN  
HAL R. LIEBERMAN  
ILANN M. MAAZEL  
KATHERINE ROSENFELD  
ZOE SALZMAN  
SAM SHAPIRO  
EARL S. WARD  
O. ANDREW F. WILSON

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
600 FIFTH AVENUE AT ROCKEFELLER CENTER  
10<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10020

TEL: (212) 763-5000  
FAX: (212) 763-5001  
www.ecbawm.com

VASUDHA TALLA  
ERIC ABRAMS  
DAVID BERMAN  
NICK BOURLAND  
DANIEL M. EISENBERG  
SARA LUZ ESTELA  
SARAH MAC DOUGALL  
SANA MAYAT  
HARVEY PRAGER  
VIVAKE PRASAD  
MAX SELVER  
EMILY K. WANGER

August 9, 2023

**BY ECF**

Hon. Jesse M. Furman  
United States District Judge  
U.S. Courthouse, 40 Foley Square  
New York, New York 10007

*Re: Accent Delight Int'l Ltd. v. Sotheby's et al.*, No. 18 Civ. 9011

Dear Judge Furman:

The parties jointly request an extension of the opposition deadline for the motions *in limine*. The motions are due on August 31, 2023. Currently, under Rules 6.B and 6.F of Your Honor's Individual Rules and Practices in Civil Cases, oppositions to the motions are due 7 days later, on September 7, 2023. Plaintiff and Defendants each anticipate filing motions *in limine* regarding multiple factually and legally complex issues. As such, the parties anticipate needing additional time to prepare their oppositions. For the same reason, the parties also request leave to file replies in support of their motions *in limine*, and an extension of the default deadline under Local Rule 6.1(b) of 7 days for replies. The parties are not requesting a change of the initial date of August 31 for motions *in limine* to be filed.

Therefore, we ask the Court to order the following briefing schedule:

**August 31, 2023 – parties file motions *in limine***  
**October 5, 2023 – parties file oppositions to motions *in limine***  
**October 26, 2023 – parties file replies in support of motions *in limine***

This is the first request for an extension of the opposition deadline for motions *in limine*. Although the parties have previously requested—and the Court has granted—two extensions of the August 31 deadline for the joint pretrial order and required pretrial filings, that deadline would not be affected by the requested extension of the motion *in limine* briefing schedule for oppositions (and, if allowed, replies).

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF ABADY WARD & MAAZEL LLP

Page 2

We also request an enlargement of the default page limit for all memoranda of law for the motions *in limine*, also due to the expected factual and legal complexity of the parties' motions. We request an enlargement from 25 to **35 pages for the opening and opposition memoranda of law** and an enlargement from 10 to **15 pages for the reply memoranda of law**, should the Court grant our request to submit replies.

Respectfully,

/s/

Daniel J. Kornstein  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

cc: All counsel of Record (via ECF)